MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C. November 29, 1951

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, November 29, 1951. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The draft of a letter, which the Chairman read, contained in the Minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on October 25, 1951, addressed to the Committee of Consulting Architects, in appreciation of their year's service, was approved.

The Secretary stated that it is necessary to send to the members a new mimeograph copy of Exhibit E pertaining to the discussion on the design for the Soldiers Home Hospital building, since the architect had made some changes in his statements.

Subject to these items, the Commission approved the Minutes.

2. GEORGE CARVER AND BOOKER T. WASHINGTON MEMORIAL COIN: Mr. deWeldon reported that, since the meeting of the Commission on October 25th, models made by Isaac Hathaway, sculptor, of Montgomery, Alabama, for the obverse and reverse of the coin had been submitted to him and that he had approved them. (Exhibit A) Mr. deWeldon said the design criticized at the October meeting had been corrected. The Commission ratified the action taken.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C. November 29, 1951

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, November 29, 1951. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Weild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Bellinschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The draft of a letter, which the Chairman read, contained in the Minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on October 25, 1951, addressed to the Committee of Consulting Architects, in appreciation of their year's service, was approved.

The Secretary stated that it is necessary to send to the members a new mimeograph copy of Exhibit E pertaining to the discussion on the design for the Soldiers Home Hospital building, since the architect had made some changes in his statements.

Subject to these items, the Commission approved the Minutes.

2. GEORGE CARVER AND BOOKER T. WASHINGTON MEMORIAL COIN: Mr. deWeldon reported that, since the meeting of the Commission on October 25th, models made by Isaac Hathaway, sculptor, of Montgomery, Alabama, for the obverse and reverse of the coin had been submitted to him and that he had approved them. (Exhibit A) Mr. deWeldon said the design criticized at the October meeting had been corrected. The Commission ratified the action taken.

Commission of Fine Arts
Minutes 29 nov 1951

Mr. deWeldon said also that instead of using an American Legion Insignia for the reverse, a map of the United States was shown.

3. REZONING SOUTH SIDE OF M STREET, GEORGETOWN: Mr. Peets reported that a Hearing was held on rezoning the south side of M Street, Georgetown, on November 1, 1951. (Mr. Peets also drafted a special letter, which was sent. Exhibit B). He said:

> This morning's papers say that the rezoning was denied. This is not surprising because the opposition was strong, and we were not well organized. Mr. Clouser told me two weeks ago that the Zoning Commissioners 'looked for something to hang it on but couldn't find it.' At the hearing a large group of opponents was present. Their attorney argued that the change would be a hardship and would reduce property values. The Capital Transit, the largest owner, spoke against the change. A representative of the Riggs Bank stated that the rezoning would reduce values and affect unfavorably the bank's loans on property in the area. It was stated that certain business men's organizations opposed the change.
>
> The proponents were not well organized. Personally, I have avoided the zoning aspect of city planning and had never attended a public hearing on zoning in Washington. Mr. Nolen was very busy with other zoning matters and was not able to be present at our hearing. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission had considered the proposal and voted in favor of a study of the situation.
>
> At the Board of Zoning Adjustment, prior to the public hearing, Mr. Nolen made a report. This was a minority report, because the other members of the Board voted to advise the Zoning Commission against the change. Mr. Nolen asked for delay and a careful study--in contrast to our letter to the Zoning Commission, which had urged immediate action. I had no knowledge of Mr. Nolen's minority report until it was read by their secretary at the hearing.
>
> The substance of my argument before the Commission is contained in a letter from our Chairman to the Zoning Commission, dated August 17, 1951. In the discussion which followed the presentation of the opposition witnesses, I refrained from going into the question of land values and reduced tax returns, since these matters are outside our scope.
>
> Mrs. Harold Hinton spoke in favor of the change as a representative of the two Georgetown Citizens Associations.
>
> I believe that the Commission's negative decision was based, first, on the tax aspect, to which the District Commissioners naturally give great importance; and second, to the belief that the things we wish to do, under the Old Georgetown law, could be accomplished sufficiently well under the present zoning.

Mr. deWeldon said also that instead of using an American Legion Insig-

nia for the reverse, a map of the United States was shown.

3. REZONING SOUTH SIDE OF M STREET, GEORGETOWN: Mr. Peebs reported that a Hearing was held on rezoning the south side of M Street, Georgetown, on November 1, 1951. (Mr. Peebs also drafted a special letter, which was sent. Exhibit B). He said:

> This morning's papers say that the rezoning was denied. This is not surprising because the opposition was strong, and we were not well organized. Mr. Glover told me two weeks ago that the Zoning Commissioners 'looked for something to hang it on but couldn't find it.' At the hearing a large group of opponents was present. Their attorney argued that the change would be a hardship and would reduce property values. The Capital Transit, the largest owner, spoke against the change. A representative of the Riggs Bank stated that the rezoning would reduce values and affect unfavorably the bank's loans on property in the area. It was stated that certain business men's organizations opposed the change.
>
> The proponents were not well organized. Personally, I have avoided the zoning aspect of city planning and had never attended a public hearing on zoning in Washington. Mr. Nolen was very busy with other zoning matters and was not able to be present at our hearing. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission had considered the proposal and voted in favor of a study of the situation.
>
> At the Board of Zoning Adjustment, prior to the public hearing, Mr. Nolen made a report. This was a minority report, because the other members of the Board voted to advise the Zoning Commission against the change. Mr. Nolen asked for delay and a careful study--in contrast to our letter to the Zoning Commission, which had urged immediate action. I had no knowledge of Mr. Nolen's minority report until it was read by their secretary at the hearing.
>
> The substance of my argument before the Commission is contained in a letter from our Chairman to the Zoning Commission, dated August 17, 1951. In the discussion which followed the presentation of the opposition witnesses, I refrained from going into the question of land values and reduced tax returns, since these matters are outside our scope.
>
> Mrs. Harold Hinton spoke in favor of the change as a representative of the two Georgetown Citizens Associations.
>
> I believe that the Commission's negative decision was based, first, on the tax aspect, to which the District Commissioners naturally give great importance; and second, to the belief that the things we wish to do, under the Old Georgetown law, could be accomplished sufficiently well under the present zoning.

It should be recognized that the denial of our request may have the compensating effect of avoiding an increase of organized opposition to the Old Georgetown Law. It is probable that if in the future this Commission should have reason to favor a zoning change, it would be wise to leave the initiation of such a movement to local citizens' groups.

The Zoning Commission confirmed the action taken. (Exhibit B-1)

4 ARMSTRONG TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect, submitted a revised design for the Armstrong Technical High School, to be built on the Brentwood Parkway in Northeast Washington.

The Commission inspected the design. There was some discussion regarding the height of the doors for the building, and the suggestion was made that they should be of uniform height. Mr. Coe said,-"I wish to simplify the design. As to the omission of bands objected to in the original design, I have an idea we can do this in a gray brick. I found out that I may have convinced somebody that we don't have to use Occoquan (red) brick all the time on a job of this type. We are designing it now for gray brick. I am using a very flat sill. The trim will be granite if made available."

As to a question raised by Mr. Coe as to whether or not to make the steps in the areaways the same material as the trim around the door, Prof. Belluschi said, "I think it would be better if you kept it the same as the building."

There was some further discussion as to the height of the doorways. Prof. Hudnut said, "You get a different scale when you change the height of the doorway." Mr. Coe pointed out that while two of the doorways are at the same level the third one is not; "by the grade dropping down, we need steps inside." Prof. Belluschi remarked, "I think it is rather important that the top of the doors be kept at the same level." Mr. Peets felt that the third door, that is the door to the auditorium, has the

It should be recognized that the denial of our request may have the compensating effect of avoiding an increase of organized opposition to the Old Georgetown Law. It is probable that if in the future this Commission should have reason to favor a zoning change, it would be wise to leave the initiation of such a movement to local citizens' groups.

The Zoning Commission confirmed the action taken. (Exhibit B-J)

4. ARMSTRONG TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect, submitted a revised design for the Armstrong Technical High School, to be built on the Brentwood Parkway in Northeast Washington.

The Commission inspected the design. There was some discussion regarding the height of the doors for the building, and the suggestion was made that they should be of uniform height. Mr. Coe said,-"I wish to simplify the design. As to the omission of bands objected to in the original design, I have an idea we can do this in a gray brick. I found out that I may have convinced somebody that we don't have to use Occoquan (red) brick all the time on a job of this type. We are designing it now for gray brick. I am using a very flat sill. The trim will be granite if made available."

As to a question raised by Mr. Coe as to whether or not to make the steps in the areaways the same material as the trim around the door, Prof. Bellusch said, "I think it would be better if you kept it the same as the building."

There was some further discussion as to the height of the doorways. Prof. Hudnut said, "You get a different scale when you change the height of the doorway." Mr. Coe pointed out that while two of the doorways are at the same level the third one is not; "by the grade dropping down, we need steps inside." Prof. Bellusch remarked, "I think it is rather important that the top of the doors be kept at the same level." Mr. Peets felt that the third door, that is the door to the auditorium, has the

appearance of being rectangular rather than vertical in appearance as the other two. Mr. Coe replied that this is due to the fact that at the October meeting of the Commission it was suggested that the entrance be made wider because the lobby was made wider. Prof. Hudnut remarked that this door makes the auditorium out of scale with the building.

After some further discussion, the Commission approved the design. (Exhibit C)

5. RESTORING PORTRAITS IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT: The Secretary reported that, in accordance with the Chairman's request, and in company with Mr. deWeldon, he had brought correspondence from Mr. Harold F. Cross, Conservator and Restorer of Paintings, 1820 Jefferson Place, N. W. of this city, on the subject to the attention of the Honorable Jess Larson, Administrator of General Services (Exhibit D) and also talked with Mr. A. E. Snyder, Assistant to the Administrator, about the project. It has been thought that General Services Administration should have charge of the project and administer such funds as Congress might make available for it. The Government has about 1500 portraits of former Secretaries, etc., and paintings generally displayed on the walls in Government buildings, including the U. S. Supreme Court, and the Capitol. It has been suggested that at least $25,000 be made available the first year.

Mr. Larson was invited to have luncheon with the Commission and discuss the subject during the afternoon, but he sent word that circumstances prevented him from being present at this meeting of the Commission. However, indications are that he will attend the next meeting. (Exhibit D-1)

6. SOLDIERS HOME HOSPITAL: Colonel Alan J. McCutchen, Corps of Engineers and District Engineer, submitted a revised design for the proposed addition to the Soldiers Home Hospital.

appearance of being rectangular rather than vertical in appearance as the other two. Mr. Coe replied that this is due to the fact that at the October meeting of the Commission it was suggested that the entrance be made wider because the lobby was made wider. Prof. Hudnut remarked that this door makes the auditorium out of scale with the building.

After some further discussion, the Commission approved the design. (Exhibit C)

5. RESTORING PORTRAITS IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT: The Secretary reported that, in accordance with the Chairman's request, and in company with Mr. deWeldon, he had brought correspondence from Mr. Harold P. Cross, Conservator and Restorer of Paintings, 1820 Jefferson Place, N. W. of this city, on the subject to the attention of the Honorable Jess Larson, Administrator of General Services (Exhibit D) and also talked with Mr. A. E. Snyder, Assistant to the Administrator, about the project. It has been thought that General Services Administration should have charge of the project and administer such funds as Congress might make available for it. The Government has about 1500 portraits of former Secretaries, etc., and paintings generally displayed on the walls in Government buildings, including the U. S. Supreme Court, and the Capitol. It has been suggested that at least $25,000 be made available the first year.

Mr. Larson was invited to have luncheon with the Commission and discuss the subject during the afternoon, but he sent word that circumstances prevented him from being present at this meeting of the Commission. However, indications are that he will attend the next meeting. (Exhibit D-1)

6. SOLDIERS HOME HOSPITAL: Colonel Alan J. McCutcheon, Corps of Engineers and District Engineer, submitted a revised design for the proposed addition to the Soldiers Home Hospital.

Mr. Irwin Porter, member of the firm of Porter and Sons, architects of this city, explained the drawing. A sample of the material (cast stone by the Earley Process) was inspected.

The Commission felt there was an improvement in the design, but offered suggestions that would still further improve it. Mr. Neild suggested strongly that the architects try to push the central part of the building back. In order to expedite the project, the Commission suggested that Mr. Porter send several sets of revised sketches to the Commission for consideration prior to the next meeting of the Commission. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes. (Exhibit E)

7. IWO JIMA MEMORIAL: On the way to the Arlington National Cemetery, the Commission inspected a suggested location for the Iwo Jima Memorial, at the north end of Columbia Island. The memorial was designed by Mr. deWeldon, and there is authority from Congress to erect the memorial in the District of Columbia. Mr. Neild is designing the pedestal for the monument.

The Secretary reported on the erection of a similar monument, also designed by Mr. deWeldon but smaller in scale than this monument, which is to be in bronze. The former is located at the Marine Headquarters Base at Quantico, Virginia, and was dedicated on November 10, 1951, the 176th anniversary of the founding of the Marine Corps.

Mr. Peets said that such a large monument on Columbia Island would require considerable grading and landscape treatment. He therefore wished to give the matter study. Mr. Finley thought a site in the Arlington National Cemetery might be more suitable, but the question was raised as to whether or not it would require an amendment to the Act of Congress to place it there. It was suggested that possibly still other sites in the District of Columbia might be available for the memorial.

Mr. Irwin Porter, member of the firm of Porter and Bone, architects of this city, explained the drawing. A sample of the material (cast stone by the Earley Process) was inspected.

The Commission felt there was an improvement in the design, but offered suggestions that would still further improve it. Mr. Meild suggested strongly that the architects try to push the central part of the building back. In order to expedite the project, the Commission suggested that Mr. Porter send several sets of revised sketches to the Commission for consideration prior to the next meeting of the Commission. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes. (Exhibit E)

7. IWO JIMA MEMORIAL: On the way to the Arlington National Cemetery, the Commission inspected a suggested location for the Iwo Jima Memorial, at the north end of Columbia Island. The memorial was designed by Mr. deWeldon, and there is authority from Congress to erect the memorial in the District of Columbia. Mr. Meild is designing the pedestal for the monument.

The Secretary reported on the erection of a similar monument, also designed by Mr. deWeldon but smaller in scale than this monument, which is to be in bronze. The former is located at the Marine Headquarters Base at Quantico, Virginia, and was dedicated on November 10, 1951, the 176th anniversary of the founding of the Marine Corps.

Mr. Peets said that such a large monument on Columbia Island would require considerable grading and landscape treatment. He therefore wished to give the matter study. Mr. Finley thought a site in the Arlington National Cemetery might be more suitable, but the question was raised as to whether or not it would require an amendment to the Act of Congress to place it there. It was suggested that possibly still other sites in the District of Columbia might be available for the memorial.

8. STATUE, THE LAST FAREWELL, GREAT ENTRANCE TO THE ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY: The Commission inspected a full-sized photographic enlargement of the model by A. A. Weinman, sculptor, for a statue to be placed in the large niche of the exedra of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery. The model had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts in 1935. The statue is to be about 18 feet high and the pedestal about 6 feet. A preliminary design of the pedestal had been made by the architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, McKim, Mead and White, of New York City. Mr. James Kellum Smith, representing the firm, was present.

The Commission decided that the pedestal should be simplified, and that the panels, medallions and coffers of the niche should be removed. Also attention should be given to landscape and planting features in front of the niche.

The Commission recommended that the statue be given a green patina, using an undercoat of gold leaf treated with copper sulphate, so that it will not shine.

Before giving final approval, the Commission requested a revised design of the pedestal, a sample of granite for the pedestal, which should be rather dark, a scheme for treatment of the niche, as well as a landscape plan for the treatment of the area adjacent to the exedra, and a planting plan. (Exhibit F)

9. FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission inspected objects of art proposed for purchase by Director Wenley and approved them. (Exhibit G)

10. BILLS PERTAINING TO THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission gave further consideration to the list of bills mentioned at the meeting of the Commission on October 25th, as affecting the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission decided that since a report is being formulated to be sent to the President of the United States, the Commission would prefer to make no specific comments by way of amendments or recommendations. A letter was

no specific comments by way of amendments or recommendations. A letter was sent to the President of the United States, the Commission would prefer to make

The Commission decided that since a report is being formulated to be

Commission on October 25th, as affecting the Commission of Fine Arts.

gave further consideration to the list of bills mentioned at the meeting of the

10. BILLS PERTAINING TO THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission

posed for purchase by Director Manley and approved them. (Exhibit C)

9. FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission inspected objects of art pro-

dark, a scheme for treatment of the niche, as well as a landscape plan for the

of the pedestal, a sample of granite for the pedestal, which should be rather

not shine.

ing an undercoat of gold leaf treated with copper sulphate, so that it will

The Commission recommended that the statue be given a green patina, un-

the panels, medallions and coffers of the niche should be removed. Also et-

The Commission decided that the pedestal should be simplified, and that

represented the firm, was present.

rial Bridge, Heller, Weed and Unite, of New York City. Mr. James Fallon, with

design of the pedestal had been made by the architects of the Arlington Memo-

The model had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts in 1935. The statue is to be about 18 feet high and the pedestal about 6 feet. A preliminary

nions of the Senate of the Grant Embrace to the Arlington National Cemetery.

the model by A. A. Weinman, sculptor, for a statue to be placed in the large

CEMETERY: The Commission inspected a full-sized plaster preparatory of

8. STATUE, THE LAST PARAGRAPH, GREAT ENTRANCE TO THE ARLINGTON NATIONAL

sent accordingly to Congressman Wier regarding H. J. Res. 346, and a similar letter to Congressman Carroll D. Kearns regarding H. R. 5404; to Congressman Celler regarding H. J. Res. 349; and to Senator James E. Murray regarding S. J. Res. 105. (Exhibit H)

11. GOVERNMENT AND ART: During the afternoon the Commission considered the four volumes of testimony covering Hearings on the subject held during the past eight months, and a preliminary outline (Exhibit I) prepared by Professor Hudnut to help in preparing the Report to the President. Members of the Commission were assigned special subjects. Mr. Neild said he desired to give special attention to Latin American Art. The Secretary was assigned Part III A & B, pertaining to the City of Washington, the L'Enfant Plan; and the Commission of Fine Arts—its history and activities.

(Subsequently Mr. Finley concluded that the services of some one should be secured who could condense the testimony of the four volumes above mentioned, or amplify it where necessary, so as to relieve the members of the Commission of much work. The members were contacted by telephone, and they agreed to Chairman Finley's suggestion. It was decided to allocate $500. for this work, and Mr. Finley was authorized to secure the services of a competent person accordingly.)

12. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold their next meeting in Washington on Thursday, January 10, 1952 and possibly also on Friday, January 11th.

The Commission adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

On the invitation of Chairman Finley, the Commission had luncheon at the National Gallery of Art.

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Department Building

Washington D. C.

November 15, 1951

Dear Mr. Phillips:

In behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts, I approve the models which you have submitted of a revised design for the obverse and reverse of the proposed George Washington Carver and Booker T. Washington Commemorative half dollar.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

s/ Felix W. deWeldon,
t/ FELIX W. deWEIDON,

Sculptor Member of the Commission.

Mr. S. J. Phillips, President,
Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial,
Booker T. Washington Birthplace, Virginia.

EXHIBIT A

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

November 21, 1951

The Zoning Commission,
District of Columbia,
Washington D. C.

Dear Sirs:

The following is a statement of this Commission's reasons for proposing to the Zoning Commission that the zoning of a strip of land along the south side of M Street in Georgetown be changed from First Commercial to Second Commercial.

The disparity between the zoning of the north and south sides of M Street was brought to our attention by the group of architects who assist us in cases arising under the "Old Georgetown Law." That law requires the Commission of Fine Arts, when applications are made to the district officials for permits to demolish, remodel, or build structures in the specified area, to advise the Commissioners of the District concerning the effect of the proposed work on the protection and preservation of the historic values of Old Georgetown.

In view of the wording used in the law and of the generally accepted practice of experts in the preservation of buildings and towns, we believe that the desire of Congress is to create a harmonious setting for the old buildings of the area--not merely to preserve them individually. We therefore take a community view of each case; we try to secure the preservation of groups of buildings and to save buildings of secondary value

EXHIBIT B

when they form an appropriate setting for more important old structures. At the same time we are anxious to see Georgetown continue to be busy, prosperous, and alive.

Taking this approach and believing that it is our duty to maintain a broad and long view of the objectives defined by Congress, we have shared the concern of all Georgetown residents as to the condition of M Street.

In recent years M Street has declined in activity and appearance. What makes this especially deplorable is that M Street is a portal street to Georgetown; many people gain their impression of the town from this street alone. Further, it is historically the central and most important shopping street of the area and still contains many buildings of architectural and historical interest.

In spite of the street's present condition many residents of Georgetown see signs of improvement and have confident hopes for the future. Several excellent stores seem well established, and a number of rehabilitations—even on the south side of the street—have taken place in recent months. The principal basis for optimism, however, is the great and continuing growth in the purchasing power of the people of Georgetown. This has not yet been expressed in the shopping habits of the neighborhood, perhaps for the reason that the commercial facilities have not become adjusted to the character of this potential business. We are told by city planners that such an adjustment would be encouraged by—and might even be dependent upon—the proposed change in zoning.

The interest of the Commission of Fine Arts in this situation, under the Old Georgetown Law, lies in two directions. First, we are anxious to

have M Street become again a healthy and attractive street, playing the role it played in old-time Georgetown. Second, we should like to see the old buildings put to uses that will facilitate their preservation.

The first of these motives, though not specifically within the scope of the law, is important to the full realization of its intent. A street which at night is lined with bright showwindows and full of activity on one side, while the opposite sidewalk is little used and the windows are mostly dark, is a street which is only half alive.

The second motive mentioned above relates directly to our legal responsibility. It is true, of course, that second commercial areas are covered, just as much as first commercial, by the Old Georgetown law, If rezoning is denied, the Commissioners of the District, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, will continue to act under the law, effecting the preservation of old buildings and the appropriate design of new ones to the extent possible in each individual case. Yet it must be recognized that the occupations characteristic of the second commercial district are not well adapted to the application of this procedure. In the second commercial classification one finds heavy construction, unusual story-heights, and large yards for work and storage. These conditions inevitably conflict—much more than retail commerce does—with the older existing structures. In the present case, since most of the old buildings on the south side of M Street were designed for retail and residential use,a change to first commercial would definitely facilitate the preservation or acceptable remodeling of the old structures and the harmonious design of new ones.

We are anxious that the change, if adopted, may interfere just as little as possible with the operation and growth of existing businesses. A strip

one hundred feet wide would be sufficient and the Zoning Commission may find that an even narrower strip would meet the essential purpose of our proposal.

Property owners in the area affected by the proposed change have laid before the Zoning Commission a statement of the losses--in property values and other forms--which they anticipate will be caused by the change. It is, of course, the function of the Zoning Commission to determine whether these sacrifices are reasonable or unreasonable. We would not, however, have suggested the change if we did not believe that it is necessary for the most effective compliance with the Old Georgetown Law. And we are confident that the law, though it may cause hardships in some cases, will ultimately be of great benefit to the people of Georgetown.

Sincerely yours

s/ David E. Finley
t/ DAVID E. FINLEY
per H. P. C.
Chairman

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Zoning Commission

E. D. 263824 December 5, 1951

CASE #15

David E. Finley, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

My dear Mr. Finley:

The Zoning Commission in executive session on November 28, 1951, after public hearing held on November 1, 1951 and inspection of the property by members of the Commission, denied a proposal to change from Second Commercial, 60' "D" Area to First Commercial, 60' "D" Area all property so zoned in squares 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1186, and 1184, having frontage on the south side of M Street between 29th and 34th Streets, N. W., as shown by plat on file in the Office of the Zoning Commission.

In taking this action the Commission adopted the report of the majority of the Zoning Advisory Council, but did not concur fully with its recommendations, being of the opinion that the proposed change was unwarranted at this time. A copy of the majority Zoning Advisory Council's report is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

S/ H. G. Ashton
T/ H. G. ASHTON,
Executive Officer.

Enc. 1.

EXHIBIT B-1

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Zoning Commission

E. D. 26382A December 5, 1951

CASE #15

David B. Finley, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

My dear Mr. Finley:

The Zoning Commission in executive session on November 26, 1951, after public hearing held on November 1, 1951 and inspection of the property by members of the Commission, denied a proposal to change from Second Commercial, 60' "D" Area to First Commercial, 60' "D" Area all property so zoned in squares 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1186, and 1184, having frontage on the south side of M Street between 29th and 34th Streets, N. W., as shown by plat on file in the Office of the Zoning Commission.

In taking this action the Commission adopted the report of the majority of the Zoning Advisory Council, but did not concur fully with its recommendations, being of the opinion that the proposed change was unwarranted at this time. A copy of the majority Zoning Advisory Council's report is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

S/ H. G. Ashton
T/ H. G. ASHTON,
Executive Officer.

Enc. 1.

EXHIBIT B-1

October 31, 1951

REPORT OF THE ZONING ADVISORY COUNCIL

CASE #15 OCTOBER 31, 1951 HEARING

Proposal to change from Second Commercial, 60' "D" Area to First Commercial, 60' "D" Area all property so zoned in squares 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1186, and 1184, having street frontage on the south side of M Street between 29th and 34th Streets, N.W., as shown by plat on file in the Office of the Zoning Commission.

This proposal results from a request of the Commission of Fine Arts that the Second Commercial portion of the frontage on the south side of M Street be studied and changed to a First Commercial classification. The request has been activated by what is termed by the Commission difficulties in the adoption of a long range architectural plan for the renovation and restoration of M Street westward from 28th Street. The Commission states that these difficulties are caused by the difference in the zoning classification along the north side of M Street which is First Commercial.

The staff of the Zoning Commission completed its survey on September 21st finding facts as follows:

The total frontage involved from 29th to 34th Streets is 2,365 linear feet abutting M Street. Of this frontage all but 140 feet or 6% is used for commercial purposes. This 6% includes 7 dwellings and one unimproved lot. All of the dwellings are old and in rundown condition. 565 feet or 24% of the frontage is used or designed for Second Commercial purposes or for quasi-Second Commercial use. There were no vacancies in this category at the time of survey. The remaining frontage constituting 1660 feet or 70% of the total is designed or used for First Commercial purposes. 10% of it, aggregating a total of 7 buildings, were unoccupied at the time of survey.

Although no survey was made on the north side of the street a few store vacancies were noted and several buildings are used for residential purposes. With the exception of one renovated building for residential use at the corner of 35th Street (beyond the survey area) there was no indication of any trend of conversion

October 31, 1951

REPORT OF THE ZONING ADVISORY COUNCIL

Case #15 October 31, 1951 MEETING

of commercial buildings for residential use nor any evidence of razing for such purpose.

The use of M Street property in this area has in modern times been subjected to at least two widely separated stages of shopping habit. Beginning from the pre zoning era and continuing to approximately 1935 Georgetown and particularly M Street but also including a portion of lower Wisconsin Avenue was the most convenient shopping center for nearby residents of Montgomery and Arlington Counties. During this period all types of local and service business thrived, store space was at a premium and there was no problem of over-commercialization. Following the commercial development of the two county areas there was a noticeable decrease in transient business for the Georgetown area. As these outlying shopping centers became more and more self-contained and automobile ownership more numerous, transient shopping habits in the Georgetown area finally reached the point where business had become dependent upon only a very limited number of persons residing outside the area. A considerable number of transfers in tenancy resulted, and more numerous vacancies were created with a resulting decrease in property values and taxable income.

The completion of the Whitehurst Freeway several years ago marked the beginning of what is now apparently a third trend. With the loss of much through west bound traffic along M Street the merchants have become dependent almost entirely upon the business of local and neighborhood shoppers. This has been particularly true with respect to the south side of the Street within the area here under consideration, and now poses a serious problem as to what, in the public interest, is the best zoning solution. From the history and the facts outlined the Council draws these conclusions:

1. The property on both sides of the street is currently used or developed at least 95% for commercial purposes.

2. There is no trend toward conversion of commercial buildings to residential uses.

) 15 (Cont'd.)

commercial buildings for residential use nor any evidence of taxing for such

pose.

The use of M Street property in this area has in modern times been subjected

st least two widely separated stages of shopping habit. Beginning from the pre

ing era and continuing to approximately 1925 Georgetown and particularly M Street

also including a portion of Lower Wisconsin Avenue was the most convenient

pping center for nearby residents of Montgomery and Arlington Counties. During

e period all types of local and service business thrived, store space was at a

mium and there was no problem of over-commercialization. Following the commercial

elopment of the two county areas there was a noticeable decrease in transient

ness for the Georgetown area. As these outlying shopping centers became more

more self-contained and automobile ownership more numerous, transient shopping

ffic in the Georgetown area finally reached the point where business had become

endent upon only a very limited number of persons residing outside the area. A

siderable number of transfers in tenancy resulted, and more numerous vacancies

e created with a resulting decrease in property values and taxable income.

The completion of the Baltimore Freeway several years ago marked the beginning

what is now apparently a third trend. With the loss of much through west bound

ffic along M Street the merchants have become dependent almost entirely upon the

siness of local and neighborhood shoppers. This has been particularly true with

spect to the south side of the street within the area here under consideration.

ese pose a serious problem as to what, in the public interest, is the best

ing solution. From the history and the facts outlined the Council draws these

clusions:

1. The property on both sides of the street is currently used or developed

least 95% for commercial purposes.

2. There is no trend toward conversion of commercial buildings to residential

s.

3. There is apparently already an over-supply of First Commercial zoning along M Street, as there are First Commercial use vacancies in both existing First Commercial area and in the Second Commercial area.

4. There are no Second Commercial vacancies in the M Street area as zoned.

5. Due to the greater number of uses permitted in the Second Commercial District, there is more possibility that some may become objectionable and affect property values adversely if not properly controlled. Except for one use, the junk yard, none of these permitted uses are objectionable per se.

6. Approval of the change here proposed will result in availability for a lesser number of commercial uses and will tend toward a reduction in property values with a resulting decrease in District revenues.

7. The plan suggested by the Fine Arts Commission is fully comprehensive. However, the existing plan on the basis of transition treatment approaching a waterfront industrial area is equally comprehensive.

The facts available to the Council at this time appear insufficient to justify the rezoning requested. The Council accordingly recommends denial without prejudice and a reconsideration of the case should the Fine Arts Commission, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Citizen's groups or others be able to submit additional factual data not now available to the Council.

The Council also recommends that the Commission, as soon as feasible and practicable, initiate proceedings to prohibit the establishment of junk yards in the Second Commercial area. (E. D. 263824).

(S) R. O. CLOUSER

(S) JOHN NOLEN, JR. (dissenting)

(S) T. J. HAYES

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Washington D. C.

November 30, 1951

Dear Mr. Coe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 29, 1951, approved the revised design which you submitted for the proposed Armstrong Senior Technical High School.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

S/ David E. Finley
t/ DAVID E. FINLEY,

Chairman.

Mr. M. A. Coe,
Municipal Architect,
Government of the
District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Bldg. - Wash. D.C.

November 15, 1951

Dear Mr. Larson:

Honorable David E. Finley, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, has asked me to bring to your attention the attached letter, dated October 16, 1951, from Mr. Harold F. Cross, Conservator and Restorer of Paintings, 1820 Jefferson Place, N. W., Washington D. C., concerning a project in which the Commission of Fine Arts is much interested, namely the appointment by the Government of a professional restorer of paintings.

As is indicated in the accompanying explanatory data, furnished by Mr. Cross as a result of a preliminary survey, there are fully 1500 paintings owned by the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial departments of the Government. Many of these paintings are the work of distinguished artists of this country and date back more than 100 years; yet once being placed on the walls of a room, they receive little or no attention after that. Consequently, some of the paintings are in a bad state of disrepair and should have the attention of a restorer of paintings without delay.

It is the practice of several departments of the Government to have a painting of a Secretary executed promptly after leaving office. At the Capitol it is customary to secure a painting of the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Also, there are secured, regularly, paintings of the Chief Justice of the United States as well as Associate Justices. Then there are the paintings of Presidents

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington, D. C.

November 15, 1951

Dear Mr. Larson:

Honorable David E. Finley, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, has asked me to bring to your attention the attached letter, dated October 16, 1951, from Mr. Harold F. Cross, Conservator and Restorer of Paintings, 1320 Jefferson Place, N. W., Washington D. C., concerning a project in which the Commission of Fine Arts is much interested, namely the appointment by the Government of a professional restorer of paintings.

As is indicated in the accompanying explanatory data, furnished by Mr. Cross as a result of a preliminary survey, there are fully 1500 paintings owned by the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial departments of the Government. Many of these paintings are the work of distinguished artists of this country and date back more than 100 years; yet once being placed on the walls of a room, they receive little or no attention after that. Consequently, some of the paintings are in a bad state of disrepair and should have the attention of a restorer of paintings without delay.

It is the practice of several departments of the Government to have a [illegible] office. At the Capitol it is customary to secure a painting of the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Also, there are secured, regularly, paintings of the Chief Justice of the United States as well as Associate Justices. Then there are the paintings of Presidents

of the United States and the Leading Ladies of the White House. Thus, the number of paintings is increased from year to year.

We thought that the Honorable David Lynn, Architect of the United States Capitol, would like to have a "restorer of paintings" become an appointee of his office; however, he informed the Commission of Fine Arts, recently, that, since most of the paintings are in the custody of the Executive Department of the Government, including those in the White House, he would prefer to have such office established under the Executive Department.

Mr. Finley, therefore, suggests that there be established, under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, an office to restore paintings of the Government. Such office would have one or more assistants and be provided with necessary office space, supplies, and equipment, and an annual appropriation for the work.

Mr. Finley would be pleased to have your views in the matter; and, if the project commends itself to you, we would like to arrange for a conference with you at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts sometime in the near future, to work out further details.

Sincerely yours

S/ H. P. Caemmerer
t/ H. P. CAEMMERER

Secretary

Honorable Jess Larson, Administrator
General Services Administration
General Services Building
Washington D. C.

of the United States and the leading ladies of the White House. Thus, the number of paintings is increased from year to year.

We thought that the Honorable David Lynn, Architect of the United States Capitol, would like to have a "restorer of paintings" become an appointee of his office; however, he informed the Commission of Fine Arts, recently, that, since most of the paintings are in the custody of the Executive Department of the Government, including those in the White House, he would prefer to have such office established under the Executive Department.

Mr. Finley, therefore, suggests that there be established, under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, an office to restore paintings of the Government. Such office would have one or more assistants and be provided with necessary office space, supplies, and equipment, and

Mr. Finley would be pleased to have your views in the matter; and, if the project commends itself to you, we would like to arrange for a conference with you at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts sometime in the near future, to work out further details.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ H. P. Caemmerer

Honorable Leon Lynn, Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington D. C.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington 25, D. C.

December 3, 1951

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

I am interested in the proposal contained in Mr. Caemmerer's letter of November 15, 1951, for the establishment of a project to restore paintings of the Government.

We are considering the possibliities of such a project as a function of General Services Administration in the management of buildings and whether our limited funds could be spread sufficiently to finance a small operation of this character. As you probably are aware, the amount appropriated for operating expenses this fiscal year is insufficient to support the quality of services rendered the Federal establishment previously. Consequently, the level of services had to be seriously curtailed.

If you will advise me when the Commission of Fine Arts will consider this proposal, I will attend if possible. If not, a representative of General Services Administration will be present.

Sincerely yours,

Jess Larson
Administrator

EXHIBIT D-1

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington 25, D. C.

December 3, 1951

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

I am interested in the proposal contained in Mr. Demarest's letter of November 15, 1951, for the establishment of a project to restore paintings of the Government.

We are considering the possibilities of such a project as a function of General Services Administration in the management of buildings and whether our limited funds could be spread sufficiently to finance a small operation of this character. As you probably are aware, the amount appropriated for operating expenses this fiscal year is insufficient to support the quality of services rendered the Federal establishment previously. Consequently, the level of services had to be seriously curtailed.

If you will advise me when the Commission of Fine Arts will consider this proposal, I will attend if possible. If not, a representative of General Services Administration will be present.

Sincerely yours,

Jess Larson
Administrator

EXHIBIT D-1

REVISED DESIGN FOR SOLDIERS' HOME HOSPITAL

November 29, 1951

(The Commission was joined by General Haislip, Colonel McCutchen, Mr. Porter, Sr., Mr. Porter, Jr., and Mr. Merrick.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We will be very interested in seeing this revised design. Would you like to make a statement first, either of you?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Unless the Commission would, the only statement that we have is that we have attempted to revise our design in accordance with our sensing of the Commission's comments given at the last meeting and Mr. Porter is here to do that for us this morning.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Then we will be very glad to hear from you, Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER, SR: Unfortunately, I was not present at the last meeting because the doctor put me to bed. I have read the minutes of the meeting and I appreciate the comments and criticisms. I do not agree with all of them but perhaps that is my privilege. But we have attempted to take the scheme which is a rather difficult scheme, and help it in some ways and attempt to take that monumental character out of it. It is awfully hard, you will agree with me, I am sure, when you have that center portion which is an atomic center. It is a big mass of material. It is awfully hard to make that look small. It is overpowering to your entire design.

We have not made a finished drawing out of it because we felt the criticisms of the Commission would perhaps help us along further.

This is the scheme that was submitted in exact elevation. I put that up there simply to compare it. We have tried several schemes there. We tried this scheme here with chamfered edges on it. We took that scheme and straightened it

EXHIBIT E

out, took those chamfer edges off it. We came up the other day by treating it as plain as we possibly could in this scheme.

It is a rather difficult problem because we have tremendous distances from here to here made necessary by the evacuation of patients on each floor into that center corridor. We have to have bed space in there for 42 people besides the utilities and everything making it contain everything in there, should we have a bombing. Everybody gets into here on each floor so as to be self-sufficient to itself. In developing this problem we took this portion out and lightened it up. We have a problem there because we are connecting up with the old building there, in a temporary way, so we have a passage coming through here and doors on either side. Where the Commission mentioned two doors we have lightened this whole thing up, which I agree with you was heavy, and put these three doors in here for the reason that it becomes practically necessary for people coming in this way and passing through into the existing buildings.

I do not know whether we have improved it or not and you gentlemen, perhaps, can help me out.

MR. NEILD: Mr. Porter, does your plan permit pushing that whole center back as far as your corridor, longitudinal corridor which undoubtedly exists.

MR. PORTER: Unfortunately, no.

MR. NEILD: In other words that would permit the fenestration across the front of the building unbroken and would not cause this great conflict between different elements.

MR. PORTER: The plan of that center core, there are doors that go out to each wing. Eventually there is another one that comes on here. That is the shape of it. Although the utilities are in here, those corridors run right through the center there.

MR. NEILD: That unit could not be pushed back to the rear side, you might say of that corridor?

MR. PORTER: In here?

MR. NEILD: To there.

MR. PORTER: Bring it back to there?

MR. NEILD: That is right. You do not mind my--would it be possible for this entire unit to be pushed back there. To take it off the front and give this fenetration.

MR. PORTER: Have my bombproof door at this point?

MR. NEILD: The corridor would go straight through. I think it would be a great simplification.

MR. PORTER: In other words, as I see it, the corridor would be there, just to square it up to come from these wings. It would be here and to carry into the bombproof area there.

MR. NEILD: Yes. Is that possible?

MR. PORTER: I would like to study that in plan before I answer that question.

MR. NEILD: To simplify your design problem.

MR. PORTER: Just thinking out loud it might be a hardship because practically all of the utilities are in the core--these wings have been shortened up to the smallest distance we can to get the patients into this portion. We put all of our utilities in the center core for the reason that if we had a bombing attack we would have all the utilities, the examining rooms, kitchens and everything carried through here. It might make a little bit longer for the nurses to come here in waiting on these patients here, to come back in here for the utilities.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Actually, it would be shorter would it not, Mr. Porter, because you have the same total area of exposed rooms. Therefore, your wings will be shorter and your accessibility will be shortened by the very fact that--

MR. PORTER: By putting rooms out here?

MR. BELLUSCHI: That is right.

MR. PORTER: Any reason why those rooms could not go in that atomic energy building that you now have?

Frankly, this atomic engineering is a little over my head.

MR. BELLUSCHI: The central core would be further protected by the buffer area in front.

MR. PORTER: It is interesting in talking to the engineers. Sometimes they will not let me put a brick in it this way because of this or that. They have so many millions of pounds of pressure coming against it, it is way over my head, frankly. I would be very happy to try that, carrying that corridor through there, make some other sketches.

MR. NEILD: Perhaps other members of the Commission would not agree with that, it is only my suggestion.

MR. HUDNUT: I agree with it too, if it is feasible scheme. I think it would be very much better to get rid of that concrete.

MR. PORTER: It was an awfully tough one. It still is a tough one.

MR. HUDNUT: I think it is immensely better, a very great improvement.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I agree with Mr. Neild.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. de Weldon?

MR. de WELDON: I agree.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Peets.

MR. PEETS: I agree with it, but I understand, we all understand very well, that we have asked you for a very quick reaction and we take a tolerant view, let us say, of the product of the study.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, I think we all feel you have made great progress in this revised sketch.

MR. PORTER: I have tried awfully hard and really in the years I have been an architect, which has been quite a number of years, it is the toughest problem I have ever had. There are a lot of elements that come into the problem that are requirements of the Home that make it rather difficult. We have, of course, to consider the conditions out there at the Home, the old soldiers and things of that sort. Certain requirements of General McDonald out there who is in charge of the medical end of the Home. Those things all fit themselves together. Sometimes it is the smallest sort of element involved that changes our plan completely around.

But I would be very, very happy because as you know and I think we will agree that if it turns out well the owners are going to take the credit for it, the architects get the blame.

MR. CAEMMERER: Do you have some comment on the material, Mr. Porter?

MR. PORTER: I gather from the minutes of the last meeting that the Commission did not quite understand what I was driving at with this mosaic work. This face can match limestone. It is put together and becomes actually an integral part of the concrete wall. It is tied back through the whalers. This is used as a front form. You are saving one of the forms. Then the form is taken down, (the rear form) and the whalers are taken down. These ties are stocked by different manufacturers. This pulls out leaving this whole part in the structural concrete and actually this is so tied together here that this becomes an integral part of the

wall. These ties are spaced on two feet centers, here and here and can be carried closer than that. We have always thought that two feet was enough for it.

It does save you an outside form because this mosaic acts as the form. And you eliminate one of those forms and you come back to your interior forms here.

That is a piece of ordinary Indiana limestone which can be carried into any number of colors.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Did you intend to have furring space inside?

MR. PORTER: No, this would come right against your structure.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Inside you would have metal lath and plaster?

MR. PORTER: Probably furring on the inside.

It is an interesting material, we have used quite a little of it.

MR. NEILD: Mr. Porter, what size blocks do you anticipate using?

MR. PORTER: Those can go up to ten feet.

MR. NEILD: What have you in mind on this?

MR. PORTER: On any one of these--I had in mind that you perhaps would come from a point there and carry through 1, 2, 3, 4,--about four stones carrying around ten feet.

MR. NEILD: Ten feet, more or less.

MR. PORTER: We ~~need~~ used it in the Scottish Rite Temple on 16th Street. That panel up there is about nine feet wide and I think it is around 14 feet tall, done in mosaic.

MR. NEILD: Will these joints be dry construction joints?

MR. PORTER: Some of the joints will be just marked joints in the mosaic work.

MR. NEILD: You will have expansion joints through the building, will you not, because of the size?

MR. PORTER: That is correct.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Isn't there a tendency to collect a lot of dirt, all that rough surface?

MR. PORTER: Yes, you do get that and I think perhaps you would find that you would have a great deal more dirt collecting on it than the limestone except for this one thing, the limestone we find around the city here takes the dirt, and holds it in itself, stains, where this mosaic work or this concrete work after a hard rain will clear itself.

MR. NEILD: I think that material can be made more impervious than limestone, probably.

MR. PORTER: Yes. Some years ago I tested that out. I made a basin about as large as that table and filled it full of water about that high, just a basin, and covered it with cement under it. We left it out there for two or three months. It was a test that Admiral Ben Morrell was very much interested in because you put your hand under that and still get the powdered cement on your hands. And yet we kept the basin filled with water and took care of filling it because of evaporation. That stayed up there for about a year and the water had not moved. We got nothing in the way of leakage through.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am just curious. What is the price of this composition stone as compared with Indiana limestone if one had a choice as to what you wanted to use.

MR. PORTER: As near as I can figure, this is worth, Indiana limestone--correct me, Mr. Merrick, if I am wrong--Indiana limestone in the wall is worth about $6.50 a cubic foot. This is worth somewhere in the neighborhood--on the Mosque we are doing on 16th Street, that is running--a lot of ornaments in there--that is running

about $1.25 a square foot, face. I think we can get this down in quantities without getting too much ornament in it around $1.00.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Cubic foot?

MR. PORTER: Square foot.

MR. de WELDON: How much limestone?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think you would get it for $1.55.

MR. PORTER: Limestone we feel around here runs a little bit more than that. Both are about the same. It depends on the basic materials that you are using, whether it has ornaments or stuff of that sort or whether you have to have a model.

MR. NEILD: How would you arrange your limestone if you wanted to use it on this building?

MR. PORTER: We would have to go back to the structural concrete wall with our anchors, slot anchors, and we would have to fill out the concrete to the back of that slot anchor which might be an inch and a quarter or two inches and construct our concrete structural wall, according to engineers, on this atomic energy stress and would increase roughly our wall by two inches. Where this is used (cast stone) they feel it does not increase our wall at all and actually half of this cast stone could be taken as part of your structural wall. They shy away from it at the present time but it has been found--

MR. BELLUSCHI: Was Indiana limestone suggested, using a two inch thickness with grout on back ~~slots~~? They have been doing it.

MR. PORTER: They have been doing it. On Government work we are not bound by any of our District regulations. But the District requires us to keep to our four inch limestone, and bond at least 15 or 20 per cent, 15 per cent of the firm area of the face for any normal building not taking into account any atomic requirements.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You do not have the adhesion type, inch and a quarter terra cotta veneer?

MR. PORTER: We have in Washington, about what we claim is the poorest building code in the country. It works today and is changed tomorrow and next week you have another change in the code.

MR. PORTER, JR.: That can be done under the code with relieving shelves and you are limited on the height you can go without any relieving angle.

MR. BELLUSCHI: But if you follow the suggestion that Mr. Neild made of setting the central block back, then there would not be any objection from their point of view of having limestone facing.

MR. PORTER, JR.: That is your core back, but the only thing that is in my mind is that you are pushing the problem to the back. You still have the element in back of you.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Is there any facing in the back?

MR. NEILD: Would it be prominently exposed on the rear of the building, street approach or anything of the sort. Could it be made strictly a concrete structure?

MR. BELLUSCHI: Since you are furring inside.

MR. PORTER, JR.: I would not think personally, that you would adopt that attitude, keeping in mind that perhaps that point possibly in the future with what is contemplated toward that east side of the reservation, the development that is contemplated, I would think that you would want to give that back elevation just the same attention.

MR. NEILD: That is always better.

MR. PORTER: You eventually will get North Capitol Street coming through there which will be a thoroughfare.

MR. NEILD: At least it would permit you to avoid confusion of two materials on your main front elevation.

MR. PORTER: Very definitely, sir.

MR. NEILD: This (cast stone) would be an advantage to you in design.

MR. PORTER: It is a material that I think has a lot of merit. I had a rather interesting experience on the Mosque which we are doing up here.

MR. NEILD: Has that construction started?

MR. PORTER: The Mosque proper is about 50 per cent complete. We are just beginning to get some of our coloring there. Today one of the Egyptians will approve something, tomorrow they will disapprove it. I am having my troubles all the way through.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You have to have a pen handy, when they approve something, have them sign it.

MR. PORTER: That does not mean anything in the world. They sign it in Egyptian, I don't understand it. I matched the limestone up there. It was the Alabama limestone and we took a few of these ornaments where the color comes in to match up with the limestone and they matched so perfectly that now they are complaining about changing. After once casting those things you do not change it without somebody paying the bill. But it is coming along very nicely.

MR. NEILD: If you should decide, if it should be decided that unit is better placed at the back, you could use a material on the rear that would harmonize with your limestone anyway.

MR. PORTER: Yes. That had not dawned on me, pushing it all back. I think perhaps as you all know you get interested in the problem and you try to take what your first thoughts are and try to develop it and perhaps I have been a little lax in that and I would love to make another sketch of it and see how it develops.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like to do that then and maybe present it at the January meeting, be ready with another sketch?

MR. PORTER: Yes. You know it is a rather interesting thing that when you are working for the United States Engineers and you have people in back of you--

MR. NEILD: Standing over you sometimes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: With a bayonet.

GENERAL HAISLIP: What we are afraid of, Mr. Chairman, is that we have the money now but everyday I expect a letter to come from the Bureau of the Budget saying that money is impounded and you cannot spend it, so we are desperately anxious to let a contract on this thing before they sequester the funds as they probably would do if they remembered the situation.

MR. NEILD: Mr. Caemmerer, couldn't they send us photostats of the revisions they made rapidly.

MR. CAEMMERER: Four sets of prints when your revised design is ready.

MR. PORTER: I am under contract to finish on the 28th of November.

MR. CAEMMERER: You are not to blame for this delay. That is always allowed.

MR. PORTER: It is allowed here.

MR. CAEMMERER: It is not your fault.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Mr. Porter, I believe there was one other point you wanted to explore, the sensing of the Commission, and that was the selecting of this cast stone as the material to be used throughout on this structure.

MR. PORTER: Yes.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: To avoid the conflict of materials we would adopt one or the other. The cast stone throughout or the limestone throughout.

MR. PORTER: Colonel, I feel this way about it, I feel that the center portion where we get into the atomic center, I feel that I can match limestone so closely that you could use both of the materials yet I have no feeling if the Commission would prefer it all of one material. I could go along with that perfectly all right.

MR. PEETS: Are there other buildings nearby, where it would raise a question of harmony with the environment?

MR. PORTER: I think at the present time anything we build out there is going to be quite a difference because those old buildings are brick buildings, with the Le Garde building, which has an interior dimension of 22 feet inside and they want to put a corridor down there and put rooms in. They have been wanting to do that for some years. You cannot do very much with a hospital building with eight foot corridors in a space of 22 feet. I have had arguments with the Home and United States Engineers now since '44, to get rid of some of those buildings and always get myself in Dutch by attempting to suggest that they tear the buildings down. Some day they will come down.

GENERAL HAISLIP: Might I intervene there. It is our masters the Bureau of the Budget, which keeps those buildings up. Eventually they will all come down. And this is to be the first new unit in the new Hospital and it will then be extended as the old buildings go down. But we are forbidden now to tear them down.

MR. PEETS: In that case my suggestion refers to possible future buildings rather than to this building.

GENERAL HAISLIP: Yes, sir, they should be exactly the same type.

MR. PORTER: The buildings in the new group will be the beginning of the entire group. The Domiciliary Building under construction at the present time is a limestone building.

MR. NEILD: If there were no atomic restrictions wouldn't you use limestone for facing ordinarily for new buildings?

MR. PORTER: Very definitely.

MR. de WELDON: Have tests been made with that material (cast stone) under consideration, particularly under atomic explosions through pressure and immediate vacuum afterward? I wonder if that material would not just completely disintegrate when the vacuum occurs. You cannot tell until you really make tests.

MR. PORTER: There have been some tests made. The man is more familiar with it than most people around here. It was used at Naval Testing Basin down here at Carderock, by Admiral Ben Morrell. When they thought of using it the Bureau of Standards made some tests. I am not familiar with them, but they found out that this material stood up better than any of our stones. I think they had some sort of--I know they put it in an oven and heated it up then tossed it down to below zero where limestone and marble went to pieces. This material stood up. Another test was made by Admiral Morrell, some sort of a--the pieces were hung up and then they started out with some sort of an electric spot to swing these materials around. Eventually they all disintegrated except this material (cast stone). It is a material which has a lot of merit to it. I have used it in a number of buildings. There is a building in Philadelphia which used it, of course not atomic, the WFIL Building, that blue one. You find it also in the Baha'i Temple out in Chicago. It has been used for a good many years. You have your Medical Center hospital out at Bethesda.

MR. NEILD: Bethesda has been unfortunate hasn't it, in its construction?

MR. PORTER: Very definitely because it was put in there--this material after it is cast needs about ten days to two weeks so it can cure. All those slabs out there were put up green and they had an awful lot of trouble.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Mr. Porter, what was the reason for using limestone in the wings in the first instance?

MR. PORTER: In this building?

MR. BELLUSCHI: In the first scheme which has limestone wings. What was the reason for using limestone, if you thought this material was better?

MR. PORTER: Frankly, I had in mind using one material all the way through. I built a building here in Washington which was the Evening Star Parking Plaza and used a construction down there where we hung to our slabs these panels of this concrete and I had in mind using that all the way through the building but in our discussions I think they finally talked me out of it. The use of two materials began when I told them that I felt I could match limestone with the concrete.

MR. NEILD: Have you not found that over the years, over a few years, the discoloration will be entirely different. The limestone will probably become more discolored than this material.

MR. PORTER: That I feel is right. Would you mind seeing the center portion of that a little different from the wings?

MR. NEILD: No, you mean in material?

MR. PORTER: In material.

MR. NEILD: No, personally I would prefer it all one material. But we were discussing the use of limestone adjoining this material. I think limestone probably being more porous, that in a few years--I know in the South it would--it would darken even more than this material would in color.

MR. PORTER: I am sure of it.

MR. BELLUSCHI: The point is that if you have some reason for using limestone on the wings, in preference to that mosaic, then the same reason would still exist

for using it all limestone especially in the center, the atomic portion of the building.

MR. PORTER: If the center portion were recessed I would carry through with limestone for the simple reason that we are developing a domiciliary building which is limestone. I would prefer to see all the buildings come together in one color or one texture.

MR. NEILD: It would be much better.

MR. PORTER: It was only that the center portion, the atomic center took me to the concrete work.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Unless practical reasons exist, I personally think an artificial material is never to be preferred to a natural one, unless you have some other considerations, such as introduction of brilliant color, which of course cannot be done with natural material; but if you are trying to imitate natural material with an artificial one at the same cost and practical considerations being comparable, it would seem to me the natural material would be far more desirable. Nature offers subtle variations in color, in texture, that you never can quite bring about with artificial material. It has a sort of dullness and sameness which is not very good.

MR. PORTER: I go right along with you on that. I do not use artificial materials myself unless we are introducing color or for some such reason like this atomic center. I would like to see all the buildings built at Soldiers' Home in the next few years of a material preferably limestone, because the large building that is going up at the present time, the Domiciliary Building, provides features to keep the old men together under cover and so forth and so on. This is the first unit that is being built which is about the size of the Mayflower Hotel, perhaps a little bit larger.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You will find that if you use two inch limestone with shelf in accordance with the code and put grouting on the back that if properly done, you will have a very solid and much less expensive material. Now that would not affect the thickness of your wall because you would not have to have those hooks, just the right treatment of the concrete and I think good bond is possible and there is enough experience and enough tests made to prove it is satisfactory.

MR. PORTER, JR.: Could I ask some questions of the Commission?

We, of course, have this pretty well developed as far as the drawings, by virtue of the fact that we had a completion date to meet. Along with that, the idea of pushing that center core back is very good. I like it personally very much. However, we have a functional plan which has been tremendously thought out in appreciation of the entire Soldiers' Home. General McDonald, representing the administration, has put a lot of time into these plans and has actually almost gone overboard with us and worked out the functional arrangements of our physiotherapy wings and X-ray, radiologist wings and of the beds and really we have had a wonderful time working together. What we have come up with as far as plans, of course, is based on a fundamental idea of the center core as developed.

Now, I indicate it that way because when you start out with the primary idea, you more or less channel yourself maybe in one general direction.

Now, what I want to bring out is this, that the plan that we have at the present time--in just thinking it over while we were talking here--will be changed considerably from this in order to get that wing back and run a typical bedroom by that core to disguise it. I was wondering whether or not that was something that was mandatory in the feeling of design.

Now, we had at the last meeting this design. We had definite points of criticism that came that we had attempted to judge and put into our new studies.

I wondered if in the event that, because of a new attitude of the Commission, a new road to travel down in the functional planning to develop a new exterior design, I wondered if there was not an outlet, let me say, a line of endeavor that we could follow if we could not meet the requirements of the Home by changing it so radically; if we could not get a criticism on what we have attempted to do in answering the comments from the last meeting by these sketches. I throw it up as a lost hope in trying to accommodate the Home and trying to accommodate their construction program and also trying to accommodate good architecture which we are all interested in right here. That is a long question but I throw it up for maybe some expression from the Commission.

MR. HUDNUT: May I speak to that point? I think that after examination of the plan and your clients' wishes you find that this pushing back change involves too great a sacrifice of time and effort, I think the Commission should not insist upon pushing it back. Under the circumstances that would be not quite fair because we did make definite suggestions and they have been followed. I should say that all we would request of the architect would be an effort to work out a plan that would push it back. A study of the feasibility, to see if it is possible and the Commission ought not to refuse to approve this if that proves to be a question.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would agree with that because we realize you are under pressure with regard to time.

MR. HUDNUT: I would like to add something relative to a matter of expression of feeling. As I see it, the middle section has two functions. First, it is a refuge and second, it is service. You are making an element that is refuge and service a dominant one. And you are making it the element into which one enters so that you enter into a refuge and enter into a service element and then go on

into the residential. Whereas by pushing the central block back you would get the feeling of entering the residence (the hospital) and then having as subordinate portions the elements of service and refuge.

MR. NEILD: Gentlemen, from what I know of Mr. Porter's firm I know he is as much interested as anybody in getting the best answers to this problem and I am sure that whatever is best he will attempt to do.

MR. PORTER: We wish to do, sir.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you agree?

MR. BELLUSCHI: Yes, I think so. I hope that they can find a way to do that because their problem would be facilitated to a great extent. After all the building is going to be there for many, many years and I hope you do not lose your budget appropriation. Also, I know that the architect would be perhaps very happy to have the opportunity to improve it if possible.

MR. PORTER: I do appreciate the criticisms of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Could we give Mr. Porter a decision on the material. You would like to have a decision on the material.

MR. NEILD: I think Mr. Porter has stated that if that facade can be erected without extrusion of that atomic unit that it would be limestone.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Entirely limestone, would be entirely limestone.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If it cannot be, the central portion would be cast stone.

MR. PORTER: Cast stone.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: But the wings, limestone.

MR. PORTER: Limestone.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If the Commission understands that, is that satisfactory?

MR. BELLUSCHI: No. I think that Mr. Neild said he preferred one material, if he has to go to cast stone, make it all the same.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would prefer it all one material, whatever it is.

Then, Mr. Porter, I think you have the sense of the Commission and we would like to help you. It is our duty just as quickly as possible to get the building under contract.

MR. BELLUSCHI: If we can help by having it sent to Mr. Hudnut and Mr. Neild and passing it by me--

MR. NEILD: A preliminary sketch--it does not have to be a worked out drawing.

MR. PORTER: I will be very happy to put it on the board as soon as we get back to the office and begin to make a study of that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think the rest of us would be very glad to leave the design to these gentlemen and they will get word to you as soon as they can.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

December 10, 1951

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 29, 1951, inspected the full-sized photographic enlargement of Mr. Weinman's model for the statue, "The Last Farewell," which you had placed on a temporary pedestal in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Commission felt that the pedestal should be simplified.

With regard to the statue, which it is understood will be cast in bronze, the Commission recommend that it be given a green patina, using an undercoat of goldleaf treated with copper sulphate, so that it will not shine. Also the niche needs special treatment for an appropriate background of the statue; the panels, medallions and coffers should be removed.

Before giving final approval, the Commission would like to see a revised design of the pedestal, a sample of granite for the pedestal, which should be rather dark, a scheme for treatment of the niche, as well as a landscape plan for the treatment of the area adjacent to the exedra, and a planting plan.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Harry T. Thompson,
Assistant Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington D. C.

S/ David E. Finley,
t/ DAVID E. FINLEY,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT F

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

December 10, 1951

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 29, 1951, inspected the full-sized photographic enlargement of Mr. Weinman's model for the statue, "The Last Farewell," which you had placed on a temporary pedestal in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Commission felt that the pedestal should be simplified.

With regard to the statue, which it is understood will be cast in bronze, the Commission recommend that it be given a green patina, using an undercoat of goldleaf treated with copper sulphate, so that it will not shine. Also the niche needs special treatment for an appropriate background of the statue; the panels, medallions and coffers should be removed.

Before giving final approval, the Commission would like to see a revised design of the pedestal, a sample of granite for the pedestal, which should be rather dark, a scheme for treatment of the niche, as well as a landscape plan for the treatment of the area adjacent to the exedra, and a planting plan.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Harry T. Thompson,
Assistant Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington D. C.

t\ DAVID E. FINLEY,
Chairman.

SHEET 7

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katherine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

1 Bronze vessel of the type fang i. Chinese, Shang dynasty.

1 Belt hook, gilt bronze. Chinese, late Chou dynasty.

1 Belt hook with jade inlay, gilt bronze. Chinese, late Chou dynasty. From Chin Tsun.

1 Small pottery vase. Chinese, Han dynasty. Excavated in early 1948 at Ning-Pao, Shensi Province.

1 Small pottery vase in shape of bronze hu. Chinese, Han dynasty. Excavated in early 1948 at Ning-Pao, Shensi Province.

1 Ying Ch'ing pottery vase. Chinese, late T'ang dynasty.

1 Large pottery jar. Chinese, Han dynasty.

1 Large YUeh pottery dish. Chinese, T'ang dynasty.

1 Southern Kuan pottery cup. Chinese, Sung dynasty,

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

Nov.29,1951 David E. Finley
For the Commission of Fine Arts

EXHIBIT G

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katherine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

1 Bronze vessel of the type
fang i. Chinese, Shang
dynasty.

1 Belt hook, gilt bronze.
Chinese, late Chou dynasty.

1 Belt hook with jade inlay,
gilt bronze. Chinese, late
Chou dynasty. From Chin Tsun.

1 Small pottery vase. Chinese,
Han dynasty. Excavated in
early 1948 at Ming-Pao,
Shensi Province.

1 Small pottery vase in shape
of bronze hu. Chinese, Han
dynasty. Excavated in early
1948 at Ming-Pao, Shensi
Province.

1 Ying Ch'ing pottery vase.
Chinese, late T'ang dynasty.

1 Large pottery jar. Chinese,
Han dynasty.

1 Large Yueh pottery dish.
Chinese, T'ang dynasty.

1 Southern Kuan pottery cup.
Chinese, Sung dynasty.

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

David E. Finley
For the Commission of Fine Arts

Nov. 19, 1948

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D.C.

Dear Mr. Wier: December 12, 1951

With reference to your Bill, H. J. Res. 346, "To provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes," I am pleased to report to you that a copy of the Bill was sent to each member of the Commission and the members wish me to express to you their sincere appreciation of your interest in the effort to promote activities in the fine arts of the Nation.

The Commission of Fine Arts was asked by the President in January, 1951, to conduct a survey of the Government's activities in the field of art and to make recommendations as to how these activities could be reorganized and integrated both under war-time conditions and in normal times.

Thus, in recent months, the Commission has conferred with heads of departments and agencies of the Government, as well as with representatives of museums and art organizations in this country. Much interesting and valuable information has been obtained and it is hoped soon to have a report for submission to the President. Therefore, until that report can be formulated and submitted, the Commission would prefer to make no specific comments by way of amendments or recommendations pertaining to your Bill. I shall be glad to inform you of developments in this matter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Hon. Roy W. Wier,
House of Representatives,
Washington D. C.

S/ David E. Finley
t/ DAVID E. FINLEY,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT H

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D.C.

Dear Mr. Wier: December 12, 1951

With reference to your Bill, H. J. Res. 346, "To provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes," I am pleased to report to you that a copy of the Bill was sent to each member of the Commission and the members wish me to express to you their sincere appreciation of your interest in the effort to promote activities in the fine arts of the Nation.

The Commission of Fine Arts was asked by the President in January, 1951, to conduct a survey of the Government's activities in the field of art and to make recommendations as to how these activities could be reorganized and integrated both under war-time conditions and in normal times.

Thus, in recent months, the Commission has conferred with heads of departments and agencies of the Government, as well as with representatives of museums and art organizations in this country. Much interesting and valuable information has been obtained and it is hoped soon to have a report for submission to the President. Therefore, until that report can be formulated and submitted, the Commission would prefer to make no specific comments by way of amendments or recommendations pertaining to your Bill. I shall be glad to inform you of developments in this matter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Hon. Roy W. Wier,
House of Representatives,
Washington D. C.

s\ David E. Finley
t\ DAVID E. FINLEY,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT H

PRELIMINARY OUTLINE FOR THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Foreword - Appointment by the President

Part I Relation of Governments to the Arts

(A) The function of Art in Society and especially the function of Art in a Free Society.

(B) The service of the Arts in the democratic process.

(C) The necessity of government support for the Arts and the necessity of making this support consistent with the freedom of the Arts.

(D) The purpose of the study. To determine the extent to which the Government is now meeting this obligation and to propose further means by which this responsibility can be more completely met.

Part II Government and the Arts in other nations. A general outline of activities of governments in countries other than the United States.

(A) Support of the Arts in France.

(B) Recent activities in England, with special reference to the Council of Arts.

(C) Government support of the Arts in Latin America with special reference to Mexico and Brazil.

Part III American Government and the Arts

(A) The Government and Architecture. The L'Enfant Plan; the history of the United States Capitol; the building of the United States Treasury and the activities of the Treasury architect; the McMillan Commission; government policy respecting Post Offices and Customs Offices; the present activities of the Government in building.

(B) The Commission of Fine Arts. The purpose of the Commission; its history; its activities; and its employments.

(C) Government and the Arts of Painting and Sculpture. The support of museums including the Smithsonian Institute, the Freer Gallery and the National Gallery of Arts; the activities of the Library of Congress in Art and Music; support of local museums; the encouragement of painting and sculpture in public buildings; finally, memorials, fountains and other forms of out-door sculpture.

EXHIBIT I

EXHIBIT I